

### REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed December 26, 2008, the Examiner rejected all the pending claims 1-15. In reply, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 6, and 11, and dependent claims 12-15. As such, claims 1-15 are pending. These amendments are supported by Applicant's specification as originally filed, for example, in FIGS. 4-5, at specification 4:3-7, 18:21 to 22:24. As such, no new matter is added. Applicant requests favorable consideration of the claims in view of the amendments above and the following remarks.

#### **Interview Summary**

Applicant appreciates the courtesies extended by Examiner Pesin during the telephonic interview of February 17, 2009, at which Applicant's representatives Mr. Soderberg and Mr. Tshiteya were present. During the telephonic interview, Applicant's representatives and the Examiner discussed Applicant's claim 1 in light of the Cobb reference. Although no explicit agreement was reached, Applicant thanks Examiner Pesin for the tentative agreement, subject to Examiner's further consideration, that certain features of claim 1, and Applicant's subject matter other features, which have been incorporated to claim 1 in this reply, are not disclosed or shown by the Cobb reference. Examiner Pesin didn't point out to any disclosure in Cobb to the contrary.

Applicant's representatives and Examiner Pesin also discussed possible amendments to claims 11-15. In that regard, Applicant appreciates Examiner's agreements that the amendments discussed with respect to claims 11-15, which have been incorporated in this reply, overcome the objections to claims 11-15.

#### **Claim Objections**

Claims 11-15 were objected to allegedly because of informalities. Applicant has amended claims 11-15. Claims 11-15 are now directed to "computer-readable storage device comprising instructions that, when executed by a processor, cause the processor to," as to agreements reached during the telephonic interview on February 17, 2009. As such, Applicant respectfully requests that the objections to claims 11-15 be removed.

### **Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103**

The Examiner rejected pending claims 1-3, 5-8, 10-13, and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over SAP Wizard Builder (a reference provided by the Applicant in an Information Disclosure Statement and referred to as “Screen Shots of a Wizard Builder sold by SAP AG, 7 sheets) in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,117,447 (“Cobb”). The Examiner also rejected remaining pending claims 4, 9, and 14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over SAP Wizard Builder in view of Cobb and further in view of Watson-Luke et al. (U.S. 20050114240). Claims 1, 6, and 11 are independent.

Without conceding that the rejections have merit, Applicant submits that claims 1-15, as amended, are patentable over the cited art of record.

Applicant's amended claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, “generating a user interface including at least (i) a logic flow area for a user to define a command structure for the configuration program including at least one step, (ii) a refinement area for the user to specify a configuration detail regarding a step arranged in the logic flow area, and (iii) a rule palette for the user to create a rule, wherein the rule palette provides multiple conditional operators and entry fields.”

The Examiner admits that the SAP Builder reference does not teach the following features of claim 1, “a logic flow area for a user to define a command structure” and “a refinement area for the user to specify a configuration detail.” (Office Action at page 4).

However, Applicant submits that the relied upon portions of the Cobb reference neither disclose or suggest (i) “a logic flow area for a user to define a command structure for the configuration program including at least one step,” and (ii) “a refinement area for the user to specify a configuration detail regarding a step arranged in the logic flow area,” as recited by claim 1. Furthermore, the relied upon portions of the Cobb reference do not disclose or suggest “a rule palette for the user to create a rule, wherein the rule palette provides multiple conditional operators and entry fields.”

The Examiner relied upon FIGS. 7 and 18 of the Cobb reference. However, neither of these figures discloses a logic flow area for a user to define a command structure for the configuration program including at least one step, and a refinement area for the user to specify a configuration detail regarding the step arranged in the logic area, as recited in the

present claims. Furthermore, neither of these figures discloses a rule palette for the user to create a rule, as required also in the present claims.

As such, Applicant submits that amended claim 1 is patentable over the SAP Wizard reference, the Cobb reference or their combination.

Amended independent claims 6 and 11 recite similar features as amended claim 1 does. As such, Applicant submits that independent claims 6 and 11 are patentable over the SAP Wizard reference, the Cobb and their combination for at least the reasons discussed in connection with claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner remove the obviousness rejection of claims 1-3, 5-8, 10-13, and 15.

The Examiner cited Watson-Luke reference against dependent claims 4, 9, and 11, which depend respectively from independent claims 1, 6, and 11. However, the Watson-Luke reference does not overcome the deficiencies of both the SAP Wizard reference and the Cobb vis-à-vis independent claims 1, 6, and 11. As such, Applicant respectfully requests that the obviousness rejection of claims 4, 9, and 14 be removed.

### **Conclusion**

Applicants submit that claims 1-15 are in condition for allowance, and requests favorable consideration of these claims.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Applicant : Yuh-Cherng Wu  
Serial No. : 10/829,145  
Filed : April 21, 2004  
Page : 10 of 10

Attorney's Docket No.:13906-0122001/ 2003P00271 US

Please apply any charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 3/13/09

Guy L. Tshiteya  
Guy L. Tshiteya  
Reg. No. 59,888

Fish & Richardson P.C.  
60 South Sixth Street  
Suite 3300  
Minneapolis, MN 55402  
Telephone: (612) 335-5070  
Facsimile: (877) 769-7945